

REMARKS

Prompt and favorable allowance of the pending claims in the application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the claims

In the "Amendment to the Claims," claim 1 is amended to recite a wound dressing for covering a wound including a skin adherent facing layer consisting of a "hydrophobic" discrete and "resilient sheet-like" layer of "cross-linked" silicone gel having a plurality of preformed apertures arranged in a pattern. Support for this amendment is found in the written description at pages 20-22.

New claim 21 is dependent from claim 1, and recites that the sheet-like form is defined by two generally planar surfaces. Support for this limitation is found in Figs. 1, 19 and 20, and the corresponding sections in the specification.

New claim 22 adopts the limitations of claim 1 and claim 21 with the exception of the requirement of the skin treatment agent.

It is submitted that no new matter is introduced by way of this amendment, and that the claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. Entry of the amendment to the claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

2. Prior art rejections

Reconsideration of the rejection of the claim 1 as being obvious over U.S. patent 6,207,875 (*Lindqvist*) in view of US patent 5,847,003 (*Ptchelintsev*) is respectfully requested in light of the amendment to claim 1. The remaining claims depend from claim 1 and thus their patentability is dependent on claim 1 and their individually recited features in combination with the features of claim 1 and any other claims from which they depend.

In amended claim 1, this claim is amended to more clearly define properties of the facing layer. The features require that the facing layer is a hydrophobic discrete and resilient sheet-like layer of cross-linked silicone gel.

It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art of wound dressings would not understand from *Lindqvist* to provide a hydrophobic discrete and resilient sheet-like layer of cross-linked silicone gel with aloe vera and petroleum jelly taught by *Ptchelintsev*.

Ptchelintsev discloses compositions that are of an oil-in-water-silicone fluid type. These types of compounds are described specifically as being "water soluble" (see col. 1, lines 67-68). While it is true that *Ptchelintsev* contemplates using aloe vera extracts with the oil-in-water-silicone fluid type composition (see col. 10, lines 50-59), one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that such an oil-in-water-silicone fluid type composition is different from the hydrophobic discrete and resilient sheet-like layer of cross-linked silicone gel required by claim 1.

It is submitted that the cross-linked silicone gel layer of *Lindqvist* is not compatible with the water soluble compounds of *Ptchelintsev*. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of success at creating the wound dressing required by claim 1.

Specifically, *Lindqvist* discloses a cross-linked silicone gel layer (see col. 2, lines 2-4) and thus, one skilled in the art would not understand from *Ptchelintsev* to provide a cross-linked silicone gel layer with aloe vera since *Ptchelintsev* is concerned with water soluble compositions. Further, the silicone gel taught by *Lindqvist* is hydrophobic and resilient (see col. 3, lines 63-65), whereas the composition of *Ptchelintsev* is a water-in-gel fluid type composition that is specifically water soluble (see example 4, at col. 13, lines 30-46).

While it is true that both *Lindqvist* and *Ptchelintsev* discuss the silicone compositions, the types of compositions are materially different wherein *Lindqvist* teaches a cross-linked silicone gel that is hydrophobic and has some resiliency

Neither *Lindqvist* nor *Ptchelintsev* disclose all of the features of amended claim 1, and it is established above that one skilled in the art would recognize that the silicone gel compositions of *Lindqvist* and *Ptchelintsev* are not compatible with one another. As a result, it is submitted that one skilled in the art would not combine *Lindqvist* with *Ptchelintsev* to make the wound dressing of amended claim 1.

Turning to new claims 21 and 22, it is submitted that *Lindqvist* does not disclose or suggest a wound dressing having the silicone gel facing layer required by these claims wherein the sheet-like shape of the facing layer is defined by generally planar surfaces. Indeed, *Lindqvist* clearly shows in the embodiments of Figs. 1 and 2 that at least one of the surfaces of the facing layer has sections that extend into pores or holes in the foam. As such, these sections prevent such surfaces from being generally planar.

In view of these observations, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims in view of *Lindqvist* and *Ptchelintsev* is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/725,632
Examiner: Lewis, Kim M.
Art Unit: 3772

3. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and the foregoing observations, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: July 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Justin J. Cassell', written over a horizontal line.

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205